●861

[For additional information on parental discipline, see Category 86.]

6: Smith I,Y-5 (no date) 1989
NN23 Sea Islanders NN23
South Carolina

121 Consequently, as more Black parents seek knowledge of their
855 West African heritage and strive to rear their children in
178 an African framework, the potential contribution of Sea Island child rearing research is evident.

181 The Sea Islander is known in contemporary Black folk-
121 lore as funny talking and quick to fight. The other view is that the Sea Islander is extremely religious and quick
(621) to pray. Perhaps the single most recurring report is of the cultural cohesion of Sea Island communities. It is this cohesiveness which makes Sea Islanders a unique source for research on discipline behavior.

121 Certainly the relative isolation of Sea Island commu-
621 nities adds to the possibility that its inhabitants would
•86 have similar life histories, beliefs and attitudes. These factors have been shown to act as correlates of discipline behavior. The cohesiveness of the Sea Island communities suggest that the Islanders may have similar predispositions toward discipline. Consequently, the Gullah people are a unique source of data of the effects of antecedent conditions on discipline behavior.

121 In the continued absence of systematic data on Sea Island family systems, it may be difficult for significant numbers of Black parents to develop clear conceptions of child rearing within a West African heritage. Hence, before undue emphasis is placed on direct comparisons of West

121 African and the child rearing practices of Black American parents a clear conception of Sea Island child rearing beliefs and practices may be an essential prerequisite. Until this prerequisite research is completed, projected relationships between Sea Island and West African child rearing must be viewed as merely conjecture. The intent of this investigation is to outline the child rearing discipline habits of Sea Islanders.

THE SEA ISLAND FAMILY

121 861 Because of their lower socio-economic status the use of physical punishment manifested in parental discipline may be commonly reported by Sea Island parents. However the factors of isolation and clearly defined social patterns may negate that of socio-economic status, and have the effect of diminishing the use of physical punishment. Or these factors may have the opposite influence of increasing the use of physical punishment.

121 592 861 The relatively small living space of Sea Island households coupled with a high proportion of extended family situations could produce a high use of physical punishment in discipline. Similarly the low educational attainment levels and occupational status would suggest high use of physical punishment among Sea Island parents. That whipping

121 178 861 as a form of discipline commonly found among West African peoples would be also common to Sea Island parents is

121 consistent with the postulation that Gullahs have main-
128 tained West African cultural traits.
86

At present the extent to which these relationships
121 will hold for Sea Island parents can only be postulated.
86 There exists in the literature few clear statements describing the rearing practices and beliefs of Gullah Blacks. Neither is it clear how these rearing practices and attitudes have been formed or modified as a consequence of time, isolation, and/or as a result of the American experience. Likewise the extents to which the discipline practices and beliefs of Sea Islanders is commonly held across generations can only be postulated. It is not clear whether younger islanders hold attitudes toward discipline which mirror the views of older islanders, or if there is a trend toward more attunement to the rearing practices and discipline methods commonly found among urbanized youths. Neither is the literature clear on the discipline attitudes and practices of island parents in comparison to their elders. The intent of the present investigation is to provide some indication of the discipline practices and beliefs of Gullah Blacks, and to provide a historical perspective of those practices and beliefs and to thereby tentatively assess the extent and direction of change.

121 PURPOSES OF THE RESEARCH

This research investigation has four primary aims:

128

V Island by sex by questions one thru thirteen.

NULL HYPOTHESIS

I a) H_0: $M_1 = M_2$
Respondents across the five islands will report no significant difference in the use of physical punishment.

b) Alternate hypothesis: H_0: $M_1 \neq M_2$

II a) H_0: $M_1 = M_2$
There will be nonsignificant differences in the use of physical punishment across generations.

b) Alternate hypothesis: H_0: $M_1 \neq M_2$

III a) H_0: $M_1 = M_2$
Males will report no more use of physical punishment than females.

b) Alternate hypothesis: H_3: $M_1 \neq M_2$

121
•861
596

DISCUSSION OF HYPOTHESES

The research is not clear on how discipline is applied in extended family situations. In households in which grandparents are present there is more opportunity for value transmission. One result may be less variation in discipline behavior across generations. The extended family structure no doubt adds to the chance for value conflicts to occur. However, the high cultural status accorded Sea Island elders may tend to negate the chance for the occurrence of value conflicts. It is also likely that younger Sea Islanders whose values conflict with their parents may

121 have left the island, or they maintain separate households.
861 The end result might mean greater uniformity in discipline
596 attitudes among Sea Islanders in general and particularly those in extended family situations.

121 The most uniform discipline patterns may occur in
861 families where mothers have clearly defined discipline
593 roles, and when grandparents are members of the household.
596 While the more common report that maternal grandparents are
603 generally more involved in the rearing of grandchildren than paternal grands, the presence of either grandparents in the household may result in more uniform application of discipline punishment(s).[20] Despite reports that grandparents tend to reject roles as disciplinarians of grandchildren, in the Black extended family situation grandparents may be much more active in this role. If the mother has no, or has an inconsistent discipline role, maternal grandparents may tend to be more permissive than paternal grandparents. This assumption is based upon the generally closer affiliation and attitudinal similarities between mother and her parents than between father and his parents. As a general view both paternal and maternal male grandparents may tend to be more restrictive of grandchildren than female grandparents. This trend would tend to be effected and modified

---

[20] Edward Apple, The Social Structure of Grandparenthood, Amer. Anthropologist 58 (1956) 56-63.

6: Smith I,Y-5 (no date) 1989
NN23 Sea Islanders · NN23
South Carolina

121 in light of mother's discipline role.[21] As an overall
861 judgement, extended families may tend to have the more
593 restrictive discipline pattern. This assumption is based
596 on the relationship between family living space and disci-
603 pline behavior. Sea Island homes tend to be small and confining which should allow for further test of this relationship.

121 Isolated Sea Island parents may use physical punish-
861 ment in disciplining more than parents living nearer to
621 mainland. This tendency may be anticipated for two reasons: (1) Sea Islanders may occupy lower positions on the socio-economic scale than mainland parents, (2) Sea Island communities are cohesively structured. This community cohesiveness is reflected in their practice of the discipline philosophy of two for one. Under this practice any misbehaving child can be disciplined by any member of the community. As the practice goes, after disciplining the child, the neighbor reports the child's misbehavior to the parent. The parent in turn has the responsibility of thanking the neighbor for a good deed. After which the child is again beaten on two accounts: (1) because of the misbehavior and (2) because the child's misbehavior has cast "bad light" on the parent.

---

[21] R. S. Tach, The Role of the Father in the Family, Journal of Experimental Education, 20, 1952, 319-361.

861 887 The elder Sea Islanders are active disciplinarians. Because of their roles as community disciplinarians coupled with the large number of households in which elders are primarily responsible for disciplining, elders will provide opportunity to assess the effect of age on disciplining (888) pattern. Because of the status positions elders hold in Sea Island communities and because of the isolation factor, it can be anticipated that physical discipline would be found to be particularly prominent. Elder Sea Islanders may also report rather unique disciplining techniques which are either in present use, or which have become extinct. This (178) possibility exists because the isolation of the Sea Island supports the retention of West African cultural patterns.

121 361 861 Some islands are more inaccessible than others. A measure of the effect of isolation on discipline patterns and techniques will be obtained through cross island comparisons. It is anticipated that there will be a linear relationship between degree of isolation and use of physical discipline.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

.861 The results reported here are on the use of physical discipline. In this review it must be emphasized that use of physical discipline is by no means exclusive; but rather is but one type of interaction in the overall discipline pattern. Verbal discipline interactions are very much a dimension of the broader pattern. To regard the use of physical discipline as the only or even as the dominant interaction to the neglect of other is a serious error in judgement.

128 The data organization and analysis represented in Tables 4, 5, and 6, are the one by one organization (1-1-1-1-1) where each one represents one Island.

128 861 VARIABLE OF ISLAND

A Chi Square was not computed on question one, because all respondents reported use of physical and verbal discipline. Question one was, "Waak kin ob punishment di ya use?" A .02 level of significance was found between the variable of island and question two, "Hov oben beetn fer dis?" The responses were: <u>everytime</u>, <u>often</u>, <u>sometime</u>. The Chi Square value was found to be 40.40 with 8 degrees of

[TEXT CONTINUED ON PAGE 57]

128
.861 freedom (df). The critical value was 39.29. Forty-one percent of the Yonges Island, and 37.5% of Edisto respondents said that they were beaten for a social behavior <u>everytime</u>. On the near islands, only 4.2% of the respondents indicated the <u>everytime</u> response. Consistently 66.7% of the James and 83.3% of the Johns Island respondents selected the <u>often</u> response. The responses were somewhat consistent across the islands in the percents saying they were beaten sometime. From James to Edisto, these percents were: 29.2, 8.3, 16.7, 29.2.

The relationship between the variable of island and question six, "How ole yã wen ya git d last beatn?" was nonsignificant at the .05 rejection level. The responses were: <u>Fourteen to Sixteen</u>, <u>Seventeen to Nineteen</u>, <u>Twenty to Twenty-two</u>, <u>Twenty-three to Twenty-five</u> and <u>Twenty-five to Thirty</u>. The Chi Square value was 10.22 at 16 df, the critical value was 26.30, the highest percent (25%) of respondents who indicated that their last beating were between 14-16 years were residents of Edisto and Wadmalaw. Twelve point five percent of the other islanders agreed. Over 37% of the islanders said beatings ended between 17-23 years. Six point three percent of the James Islanders said beatings were continued into the 25-27 range.

The relationship between the variable of island and question eight, "Wen ya waz gitten d mas beatn, hov oben?"

6: Smith I,Y-5 (no date) 1989
NN23 Sea Islanders NN23
South Carolina

128
•861

was nonsignificant at the .05 rejection level. The Chi Square value was 19.66 while the critical value at 16 df was 26.30; the responses were: Six or less times per year, one time a month, three times a month, once weekly, twice weekly. None of the James Islanders said physical discipline was metered out as infrequently as six times a year. In contrast 16.7% of the Johns, Yonges and Edisto Islanders said beatings were this infrequently. Four point two percent of the James, and 8.3% of the Wadmalaw respondents said beatings during their peak periods were as frequent as twice weekly. None of the respondents on the other islands said beatings were this frequent. Over 68% of all the islanders indicated that the frequency of beating was between one to three times a month.

TEST OF THE ISLAND NULL HYPOTHESIS (H_0: $M_1 = M_2$)

Respondents across the five islands will report no significant difference in the use of physical punishment.

1. Question two, "Hov oben beetn fer dis?" was used to test H_0: $M_1 = M_2$. This question is a measure of the relationship between the frequency with which use of physical punishment followed asocial behavior and island affiliation. The Chi Square value was 18.69, while the critical value at 8 df was 18.17. This relationship was significant at the .02 level. With a .02

128
.861

significance level, H_o: $M_1 = M_2$ was rejected in favor of the alternative H_1: $M_1 \neq M_2$.

2. Two tangential tests of this H_o: $M_1 = M_2$ were conducted. Questions six and eight were used for this purpose. Question six, "Hov ole ya wen ya git d last beetn?" is in essence a measure of the relationship between the duration of use of physical punishment and island affiliation. As such this relationship was considered as a tangential measure of the Null Hypothesis. The Chi Square value for question six and island affiliation was 10.22, while the critical value at 16 df was 26.30 (.05). In this case the chance hypothesis was upheldd.

3. Question eight, "Wen ya waz gitten de mas beetn, hov eben?" was a measure of the frequency of beetns during peak disciplinary stages and island affiliation. While this relationship was a more direct measure of the Null Hypothesis than question six it was still a tangential test. The Chi Square value was 19.66, while the critical value at .05 with 16 df was 26.30. The Null Hypothesis was upheld. The two tangential tests supported retention of the Null Hypothesis. However because of the directness of the first test and the determined significance power (02), the Null Hypothesis was rejected in favor of the alternative H_1: $M_1 \neq M_2$.

4. Although the most direct test of the relationship between

6: Smith I,Y-5 (no date) 1989
NN23 Sea Islanders NN23
South Carolina

128
•861

island affiliation and use of physical punishment was significant at the .02 level, the alternative hypothesis was upheldod with some reservation. This caution is warranted because the majority of the island relationships were nonsignificant. For example parents across the five islands indicated that both sexes received the same punishment (question 5). Similarly, there were nonsignificant relationships between island affiliation and: (a) the boundaries of asocial behavior (question 9), (b) use of both beating and scolding in discipline (question 11), and (c) the generations across the islands indicated similar problems in rearing today's children in the traditional mold (question 10).

VARIABLE GENERATION

Significance was determined at the .01 level for the relationship between variable of generations and question two, "How oben beata fer dis?" The responses were everytime, often, sometime. Chi Square was computed at 13.36 with 4 df. The critical value was 13.28. Forty-six point four percent of the children indicated they were punished often and sometime. While 14.3% of the parents indicated punishment was sometime and 60.7% said often. Conversely, 28.6% of the grandparents and 25% of the parents said they were punished everytime. Only 7.1% of the children indicated they were punished everytime.

128
861 At the .05 rejection level the relationship between the variable of generation and question six, "How ole ya wen ya git d last beatn?" was significant. The responses were: Fourteen to Sixteen, Seventeen to Nineteen, Twenty to Twenty-two, Twenty-three to Twenty-five, Twenty-seven to Thirty, with 4 df the critical value was 9.49, the Chi Square value was 2.96. Twenty-five percent of the grandparents and 10.7% of the parents said beatings were terminated between 14-16 years. Fifty percent of the parents and 39.2% of the grandparents said beatings end between 17-19 years. Thirty-five point seven percent of the grandparents and 39.4% of the parents indicated beatings were continued after the youngster reached 20 years.

The relationship between question eight, "Wen ya was gitten d mas beatn, how oben?" and the variable of generations was significant at the .001 level. The responses
861 were: six or less a year, one a month, three a month, one a week and two a week. Twenty-eight point six percent of the grandparents said they were beaten six or less times per year, while only 3.6% of the parents shared this frequency pattern. Sixty point seven percent of the grandparents, 46.4% of the parents and 39.3% of the children shared the one beating per month pattern. Seventeen point nine percent of the children and parents reported beatings as frequently as one per week. Three point six percent

•861 of the grandparents also reported beatings as frequent as one per week. Only children (7.1%) reported beatings as frequently as twice a week.

12 861 TEST OF THE GENERATION NULL HYPOTHESIS (H_0: $M_1 = M_2$)

There will be nonsignificant differences in the use of physical punishment across generations. H_0: $M_1 = M_2 = M_3$.

1. The relationship under measurement was between generation membership and use of physical punishment. The same rationale for the use of questions two, six, and eight developed in the test of the first Null Hypothesis also applies here. Again question two is the direct and questions six and eight are tangential measures of the relationship.
2. Under the direct test the relationship was significant at the .01 level. The Chi Square value was 13.36, while the critical value at 4 df was 13.28. The first of the tangential measures was insignificant. The critical value at (.05) with 4 df was 9.49, while the Chi Square value was 2.96. In this case the H_0: $M_1 = M_2 = M_3$ was supported. The second indirect test of the relationship (question 8) was significant at .001. At 8 df the critical value was 26.12 while the Chi Square value was 26.37. These significance levels (.01, .001) are the basis upon which the Null Hypothesis was

12
•861

rejected in favor of the alternative H_2: $M_1 = M_2 \neq M_3$.

3. Significant generational differences in discipline behavior and attitudes were clearly noted. As a matter of fact nine of the generational relationships were significant. Five of these relationships were significant at the .001 level. It is extremely clear that the generations differ in application of and in attitudes about discipline. There were however, nonsignificant differences across the generations relative to: (a) the age at which children are no longer beaten (question 6), (b) the causes of the last beating (question 7), and (c) on the boundaries of asocial behavior (question 9).

128
861

VARIABLE OF SEX

The relationship between the variable of sex and question two, "How oben beatn fer dis?" was nonsignificant at the .05 rejection level. The responses were: <u>everytime</u>, <u>often</u>, <u>sometime</u>. The critical value was 5.99 at 2 df the Chi Square was 2.11. Sixteen point two of the males and 32.4% of the females said the <u>everytime</u> reaction ratio was used by their parents. Fifty-four percent of the males and 59.6% of the females thought physical discipline often followed asocial acts. More males (29.7%) selected the <u>sometime</u> reaction ratio than did the females (77%).

The relationship between the variable of sex and

128
861 question six, "How ole ya wen ya git d last beatn?" was nonsignificant. The responses were: Fourteen to Sixteen, Seventeen to Nineteen, Twenty to Twenty-two, Twenty-three to Twenty-five, and Twenty-seven to Thirty. The Chi Square value was 8.80. The critical value at 4 df was 9.49. Twenty-seven point three percent of the females and 4.3% of the males said they received their last beating between 14-16 years respectively. Thirty-nine point one percent and 48% of the males and females said their last beatings were between 17-19. Twenty-four point three percent of the females said they were beaten after age 20. This compares to 66.5% if the males who were beaten after age 20.

The relationship between the variable of sex and question eight, "Wen ya was gitten d mas beatn, how oben?" was significant at .01. The responses were: Six or less a year, one a month, three a month, one a week and two a week. Only 5.4 percent of both sexes said beatings during peak periods were as frequent as twice weekly. Seventeen percent of the females said they received six or less beatings per year, which compares to a 2.7 percent for males. Thirty-five point one percent of the males and 39.6 percent of the females said beatings were no more frequent than once a month. Seventeen percent of the females and 35.1 percent of the males reported beatings as frequent as three times per month. Weekly beatings were reported by 21.6% of the

128 males and 9.4% of the females.

•861 TEST OF THE SEX NULL HYPOTHESIS (H_0: $M_1 = M_2$)

128 Males will report no more use of physical punishment
86 than females.

1. This was a measure of the relationship between the variable of sex and use of physical punishment. The rationale which applied to the use of questions two and eight in the above two cases also applies here. Question five, "Bo n Gal beet d sami?" was also used in this test. In this case question five is the most direct measure of the relationship between sex and use of physical punishment. Under question five the relationship was nonsignificant at .05. The critical value with 2 df was 5.99, while the Chi Square value was 2.73. The relationship was also nonsignificant under question two, the Chi Square value was 2.11 with 2 df the critical value was 5.99 at the .05 level of significance.
2. The relationship was significant under question eight. The critical value with 3 df was 13.28, while the Chi Square value was 15.42. The level of significance was .01. Because the direct and one of the tangential test were nonsignificant, the H_0: $M_1 = M_2$ was upheld.
3. Only four of the relationships between the sex of the respondent and discipline practices and beliefs were

6: Smith I,Y-5 (no date) 1989
NN23 Sea Islanders NN23
South Carolina

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

771
(114)

Crum[22] claimed that the Gullah people have no interest in the future. This researcher found the case to be the opposite. The Gullahs, the elders in particular, are constantly looking ahead to the day on which their life patterns will be judged fitting to "keep eternal company in the Great Kingdom." Their life paths and worldly efforts are aimed at nothing else than at the day when their deeds will be reviewed. It is with the religious context, that the discipline behaviors of the Gullah people must be understood. Malicious acts of child abuse, and the heavy handed parent are frowned upon. Discipline acts for the Gullah, are aimed primarily at keeping the child "on d steppn of d Lord," meaning that the purpose of much of the discipline behavior is to prepare the child for demands of living the religious existence. Dr. Spock's notions of child rearing have no relevance in the Gullah household. Here the teachings contained in the Bible are the guide - posts the parent follows. Discipline manifested as physical punishment appear to be no more frequent than the verbal

771
861
182

---

[22]Crum, op. cit.

771 means of socialization. The sternness of the religious
861 behaviors of the Gullah people are metered down into their
182 discipline behavior. Among these people the 99.9% effort toward adherence to religious commandments as in child rearing just is not good enough. The only acceptable effort is all the way. This often reached quest for total committment in religious activities is the basis upon which the obedience of children are judged. This must be constantly in mind when interpreting the discipline behaviors of Gullah parents.

861 Gullah parents are constant observers of the behavior
[867] of children. The boundaries around what constitutes asocial behavior are clearly understood and learned early. The child in turn knows full well what behaviors will elicit which response by the parent. In accord with the religious teachings, the parent will not hesitate to punish disobedient behavior. Punishment though is not always or most frequently manifested in its physical form, but rather the form of discipline used will depend on any number of factors in the environment. The prime determinant being the overall behavior of the child. Gullah parents emphasized to this researcher that discipline must be tendened with mercy. "Billie ya ca'n trash dem all d timb, ya gotta scol some en beet some." They felt total reliance on physical discipline in disregard to the overall behaviors and

861 [771] [593] mannerism of the child was extremely unjust. They say the teachings of the Lord make clear that if the parent blindly follows the bully path results in the child losing respect. In this belief, parents with guided deliberation employ the discipline interaction.

[577] It must be emphasized that these interactions are just not that frequent. Gullah children are respectful and obedient, behaviors which are less than that are not tolerated. In turn rarely does the Gullah parent discipline the child who has been socialized properly.

861 177 The Gullah parent on the nearer islands agreed that the properly socialized child is not a problem. This child is on the right path. But they are concerned about factors in the environment which act to make for proper rearing of children increasingly difficult. As these parents see it and as was supported by the study, on the nearer islands the effects of greater exposure to mainland life styles makes it increasingly difficult to rear children to "the proper" levels of obedience. Elder Richardson explains the situation this way: "d paren should be shami while d roun on de high skire, lib en n out of sin. D chillin got no choice dan ta act lik d paren. It ain't d chilln falt mind ya, it d blame ob d paren. Dey responsible fer d chil, dey must brin d chil ta d wae ob d bible. I jus dan't no waat goina happen ta d chilln ta dae. Ef d paren dan't see ta

861 it quik, dey is head for d fira en brim stan. But it ain't
177 dey falt."

861 The relationship being described here explains the
184 higher tolerance of today's parents and is explicable in
177 part by generational differences and in part by the exposure element-distance from mainland. In the case of exposure, the more distant Gullah families are more isolated from the mainland socializing influences. An effect of this more limited exposure is more adherence to "the discipline habits of ole." This adherence was reflected in the lower tolerance (reaction ratio) of parents on the distant islands. In further explanation, the work habits of women on the near islands contribute to their being the most tolerant parents. The occupational habits of these women frequently take them into the households of White families of higher economic status. When this Gullah parent is exposed to an alternate discipline pattern, this exposure may then underly the differences in tolerance found between sexes and islands.

593 The tolerance of differences may only be a function of
861 exposure time. The case here is that parents who are en-
184 gaged in the work force spend less time with their children than do older parents. Hence the working parent would not be as quick to react to disobedience on the part of children than would grandparents who are actively engaged in child

593 rearing for longer periods each day. Women on the more
861 distant islands are less likely to be engaged in work out-
184 side the home. They also showed the tendency to be less
[177] tolerant than mothers on the near islands. This relation-
ship adds supports to the rationale that exposure to main-
land social patterns, and the daily duration of inter-
actions with children are key elements in the measured
differences in the discipline habits of women both across
generations and islands. It might also be added that the
work habits of the women on the nearer islands both in
terms of the nature of the labor and its consequence of a
higher income base also contributes to the differences.

592 However this is not the total explanation. It is also
184 important to consider that the more isolated Gullah families
857 place more emphasis on the assignment to children of chores
861 which were central to the operation of the family unit.
[867] These tasks rather than being assigned to provide the child
with a sense of responsibility are assigned on the assump-
tion that the child already has competent work habits.
Consider for the moment the child whose task is to draw
water, to cut wood and handle the chicken coop. If the
child neglects these chores there would indeed be serious
consequences. For this neglect would noticeably disturb
the operations of the household. Those households on the
more distant islands being supplied only with wood burning

592 184 857 •861 stoves would come to a halt if wood was not cut in time for meals to be prepared. On the near islands with household supplied with only gas stoves or with both, the child's negligence would not have such dire consequences. In view of this it is easy to see hov the chores of children on the far islands would be a more serious matter, and why such households tend to operate on an everytime reaction ratio. [593] In contrast, parents on the near islands can more afford the gift of tolerance toward neglected chores, and to react to disobedience on a sometime basis.

561 593 178 861 592 Differences across the generations were much more frequent than across island and sex. The element which underly much of the differences was "en ma dae" references of parents and elder parents. The way this works is that each parent tries to rear children like they were reared. The demands of the environment in which grandparents were reared differ from the household patterns under which parents were reared. The main differences other than that of exposure were in labor habits. Grandparents were reared in farming households. Consequently as children, the grandparents were up before day-break and actively engaged in burdensome farm labor. In these farming households the tasks and responsibilities of children were even more clearly defined than they are today or in the childhood of the present parent generation. Similarly the consequences

561 593 178 861 592

of not completing tasks were harsh because chores were meaningful to the household. It is reference to this agrarian life and the demands for the obedience of children upon which grandparents draw. That the generation of parents now share significantly different childhood references than their parents merely illustrates the component of change in the agricultural habits on the islands. In agreement with this, parents reared in more distant households, where the farm habit is comparatively more active tend to mirror the views of the preceding generation. A similar positive relationship between exposure to the farming habit and the cohesiveness of discipline behavior across the two generations exist on the near islands. The generational differences found in this study can certainly be attributed to the farming versus non-farming pattern. This rationale was expressed vividly by Grand Flower, who at 78 years sees big differences in the rearing habits of her day and those of today. "Billie, let ma tell ya son, we haad no timb fer fooln. Wen d cock taak en bernean we up wete de fas cro. I go ta git d wanta en me sista she giz d wod. Wey be fa d life ob dae comin we haad d bakfas redi. Abta we done wete d pos en plata wen goin ta d fiel. Dey we waak puen sed en d grun or piken en pulen dat wat don redi, we dey til d timb com n fer fix d supa den bak ta dat huse we goin. We giz d mel fer d men fak, den we carie it ta d fiel we

561 sta en d fiel til d lite nes goin. Billie, ma un I tel ya
593 dey no timb fer d chilln to b disobedient."
178 Today's children are not reared in the farm habit.
861 Few of the parents have had long to exposure to the pat-
592 terns in which the elders were reared. It is consequently the differences in exposure and work habits which underly changes in the generational views of Gullah parents. The significance of differences in the discipline view of the two generations illustrates not only that the "en ma das" reflections of parent and older parent differ, but it is also a measure of the direction of change. Grandparents were the most frequent to respondent "ma paren use beetn everytime," while parents and children said <u>often</u> and <u>sometimes</u> more frequently. As a matter of fact, twice as many parents cited they were punished <u>sometime</u> than did elders. The direction of change between the generations is clearly that in each subsequent generation parents are less apt or as quick to punish the child.

861 Still another point to be considered in looking at
562 the relative tolerance of the female parent is that of role
[578] differences. Males consistently cited fighting as one of the chief reasons for being disciplined. On the other hand not getting the chores done was a prime reason for disci-
[462] plining girls. This is explained in that males had few household responsibilities and were not disciplined for

"undone" house chores while girls were. Upkeep of the house was clearly the female role. When you also consider that females more frequently reported that they were disciplined on an everytime ratio, role differences are again indicated.

It must be clearly understood that the difference in part may be attributable to the greater likelihood that the social behavior of female children would be committed in or close to the house, than would be the case for males. This suggests that the female asocial acts could be more readily noticed. In part, parents and elders in particular may just be more lient with male children. Certainly the "man child" attitude is prevalent here. Since females outnumber males, a premium is placed on male children. Among island parents, tolerant attitudes toward males may also be a unique cultural reflection of an African habit.

In summation, there were few areas in which significant differences exist across the islands. Islanders are quite agreed in their discipline attitudes. Much of the preceding discussion must be seen in the perceptive of broader level homogenity across the five islands. The most noticeable implication is that the isolation of the Sea Islands has to a large extent protected the cultural cohesiveness of the island community. Notions of the broad scale influence of the mainland elements on island

6: Smith I,Y-5 (no date) 1989
NN23 Sea Islanders NN23
South Carolina

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

592 178 177 The Sea Island family is a cohesive unit. Many of the tested generational relationships were significant. These differences between generations were primarily attributed to effect of changing economic patterns, and rates of exposure to mainland patterns. The island work force are now 464 177 engaged primarily in 9-5 work patterns. The pattern takes this force into job situations in metropolitan Charleston. 86 While the island men tend to work in clusters in the different industries in the region, women are heavily engaged in domestic service work. The projected results are that women because of the nature of their employment were much more exposed and consequently influenced by the tolerant discipline habits of Whites and mainlanders. In contrast, the clustering work habits of males, in which members of families are employed by the same employer has operated to negate the influence of the new work pattern on male parents. The more demanding work requirements which accom- 861 178 panies the maintenance of a farm habit was also discussed. It was said that the farm habit upon which the elder is- 561 593 landers base their discipline references was unknown to

the island children. The parents themselves have been away from this habit for nearly as many years as they were engaged in it. Consequently, the stern disciplinary demands of the farm habit was not bei. : transferred to this generation of young islanders. In this light, the childhood histories of the older parents was discussed. It was seen how the harsh work habits required in farming families demanded the obedient behavior of children. Under the burden of farm labor, parents were less tolerant of disobedience than parents are today. The reason given was again differences in occupation. It was also said that parents living in isolated communities were apt to discipline children more quickly than parents who have jobs, because they spend time with their children. For the farming parents, the fatigue element was said to diminish their tolerance level, and that isolated households operate in an everytime reaction ratio. These religious beliefs were introduced as elements which influence frequency and methods of discipline. Gullah Island parents, in this vain, strived to rear children under, and by guidance of the Bible. In discussing the sex role differences, parents tend to more rigidly enforce discipline on female children. This relationship was explained along two lines. The first was the status that the male child has on the islands. Here a dominance of females places a premium upon male children.

562
86
198

The notion that this attitude may be a reflection of an African habit was briefly mentioned. Because females tend to commit asocial acts within the family gap, this was offered in explanation of sex differences in disciplining.

518

Fighting was considered outside the female role, but a common behavior of males.

177

The reason for fighting as a more frequent behavior of males on James Island was explained in terms of the greater exposure of near islanders to mainland patterns.

11: Johnson H-4,5 (no date) 1930
(1525-ca. 1880)
NN23 Sea Islanders NN23
South Carolina
St. Helena Island

wrote, "but domestic freedom—the right just found, to have their own way in their families and rule their wives—that is an inestimable privilege! In slavery the woman was far more important, and was in every way held higher than the man. Several speakers have been here who have advised the people to set the women in their proper place —never to tell them anything of their concerns, etc., etc.; and the notion of being bigger than women generally, is just now inflating the conceit of the males to an amazing degree. When women get the vote, too, no people will be more indignant than these, I suppose."[27]

The care of the children was divided between the mother and the plantation nurse, with the other children also doing their share of "minding child." When Captain Basil Hall visited a plantation near Charleston on his tour of the South in 1828 he found the mothers in the field at their work and "a sober old matron in charge of the three dozen shining urchins, collected together in a house near the center of the village. Over the fire hung a large pot of hominy, a preparation of Indian corn, making ready for the little folks' supper, and a very merry, happy-looking party they seemed."[28] At all other times, the children were in the mother's care. It was not an uncommon sight to see a woman going about her home work with an infant tied securely to her back.

Parents were severe in the discipline of their children, for they did not want their offspring to grow up to be "no-manners." They taught them to curtesy when approached by a white person and to hold out their hands to

[27] *Letters and Diary of Laura M. Towne*, p. 184.
[28] Hall, *Travels in North America*, II, 210; *supra*, pp. 97-98.

11: Johnson H-4,5 (no date) 1930
(1525-ca. 1880)
NN23 Sea Islanders NN23
South Carolina
St. Helena Island

shake; to keep silent in the presence of elders and otherwise to show respect for age. Some of the missionaries who arrived on St. Helena Island shortly after the opening of the Civil War were indignant at the harsh treatment the children received at the hands of their parents. "I don't suppose these children ever received a caress or a word of tenderness since they were infants," wrote Arthur Sumner. "The children are invariably spoken to in harsh and peremptory tones by all grown niggers, and are whipped unmercifully on the least offence. Yet they are very obedient to their parents, and certainly stand much more in awe of adult darkies than they do of us mild-eyed missionaries."[29] Miss Towne concluded that parents were not really harsh to their children, but that their rough way of ordering them about, threatening to "skin um 'live" and to "bro'k um back," merely sounded savage. All visitors to the Sea Islands, either as guests of the master before the War or as missionaries, agreed that the children, despite the rough treatment from their parents and despite the fact that they seemed to have no games,[30] were a happy, carefree lot. Sir Charles Lyell thought the Hopeton plantation children had "such bright, happy faces when three or four years old, and from that age to ten or twelve . . . such frank and confiding manners, as to be very engaging."[31] Yet all were horrified by the fact that their mothers permitted them to run about in summer completely nude, a practice which people of today, with their recent adoption of the sunbath theory, would be inclined to approve.

[29] Arthur Sumner Papers, St. Helena Island, July 9, 1863.
[30] *Letters from Port Royal*, p. 192n.
[31] Lyell, *Second Visit to the United States*, I, 263.